



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/588,490	06/06/2000	Bharat Tarachand Doshi	48-11	9155
7590	09/20/2005		EXAMINER	
			BURGESS, BARBARA N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

71

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/588,490

Applicant(s)

DOSHI ET AL.

Examiner

Barbara N. Burgess

Art Unit

2157

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 15 August 2005. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims:

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached response.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 
13. Other: _____.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Response to Arguments

The Office notes the following arguments:

(a) Tomizawa and Sharma references fail to teach or suggest a motivation for combining the references or for modifying their teachings to reach the claimed invention. The statement of motivation is deficient representing nothing more than a hind-sight based conclusory statement.

(b) With regard to claim 1, both the first and second set of trunks carries traffic in the same direction. This feature is not disclosed by the references.

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to:

(a) In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Examiner states that the reason to combine the claimed features of Sharma in Tomizawa is in order to support dynamic routing and restoration of network services in the event of a failed fiber link.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In this case, the motivation to combine the claimed features of Sharma with Tomizawa is referenced from the Sharma reference. Sharma discloses using a four-trunk ring and span-switching for restoration of network services in the event of a failed fiber link (column 1, lines 55-61, column 2, lines 37-39, 45-50, column 6, lines 18-23, column 12, lines 8-15).

(b) The claim language is unclear as to the "direction" of traffic carried by the first and second sets of trunks. Applicants argue that both sets of trunks carry traffic in the same "given direction". Again, it is unclear as to what direction is the "given direction". Although the "given direction" may be the same for both sets of trunks, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine the direction. For example, the primary trunk of both sets of trunks could carry traffic in a clockwise direction. While the corresponding back-up trunk of both sets of trunks carry the traffic in a counter-clockwise direction. Therefore, both sets of trunks are carrying traffic in the same "given direction". In another example, both the primary trunk and back-up trunk for both sets of trunks could carry traffic in one direction, either clockwise or counter-clockwise.

Therefore, both sets of trunks are carrying traffic in the same "given direction".

However, it is unclear from the claim language as to what direction is the "given direction".

The Applicant refers to page 6, line 25 through page 7, line 19. This passage references only how the traffic is divided between the primary and back-up trunks in the upper or lower portion of the rings. There is no disclosure as to the "direction" in which the traffic is carried. The term "direction" is found nowhere in the specification. Again, "a given direction" is unclear not only in the claim language, but in the specification as well. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine "a given direction" from the specification or claim language.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N. Burgess whose telephone number is (571) 272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

September 15, 2005


ARIE ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100